

REMARKS

Claims 1-36 were examined in the outstanding office action mailed on 03/06/2008 (hereafter "Outstanding Office Action"). All the claims were rejected.

By virtue of this response, claims 1, 2, 8, 11, 12, 18, 21, 22, 28, 31, and 32 are sought to be amended and claims 7, 17 and 27 are sought to be cancelled. The amendments and cancellations are believed not to introduce new subject matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. The amendments and cancellations are made without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 1-6, 8-16, 18-26 and 28-36 are thus respectfully presented for reconsideration.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102/103

Claims 1, 3-4, 8-11, 13-14, 18-21, 23-24, 28-31 and 33-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 5,774,661 issued to Chatterjee *et al* (hereafter "Chatterjee"). Claims 2, 5-7, 12, 15-17, 22, 25-27, 32 and 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chatterjee.

Without acquiescing to any of the assertions in the Outstanding Office Action, it is respectfully noted that the presented claims are allowable over the art of record.

For example, currently amended independent claim 1 is limited to the context of work flows for synchronization/ consolidation of data between at least two data sources.

Canceled claim 7 recited at least a portion of such a feature and the Examiner rejected claim 7 confusing the term "synchronization operation" of canceled claim 7 with the term "synchronous manner" of claims 5 and 6. The terms "synchronization operation" and "synchronous manner" are clarified in the specification, which are reproduced below for the convenience of the Examiner:

Meta directory servers are often used in conjunction with data sources (e.g., database, LDAP based directory server, ERP systems) to perform operations such as synchronization and consolidation. As is well known, ***synchronization generally refers to propagation of a change (including addition, deletion, modification) in one data source to another data source.***

Consolidation generally refers to providing a unified integrated view of different pieces of data (about the same entity, e.g., an employee) present at different data sources. (Page 2, lines 9-14 of the specification, **Emphasis Added**)

With respect to synchronous mode, the execution of a task is suspended upon invoking a custom task, and execution of the suspended task resumes once the execution of the custom task has completed... (Page 12 line 20 to page 13 line 2)

With respect to asynchronous mode, the execution of a task continues even if the task invokes a custom mask ... (Page 13, lines 8-9)

Accordingly, it is concluded that the portions of Chatterjee relied upon in the Outstanding Office Action do not establish a case of unpatentability under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102/103.

In particular, Applicants assert that Chatterjee does not teach or reasonably suggest synchronization/ consolidation of data between at least two data sources.

Furthermore, the claimed custom task (containing a desired program logic specified by the user) is separate from the built-in tasks, which together when executed implement the work flow.

Chatterjee does not teach or contemplate such a custom task, in addition to such a tasks being separate from the built-in tasks. In support of such assertions, Applicants point the Examiner to the below disclosure:

It would be desirable to have a system and method that is flexible enough to automate a variety of tasks, as well as to allow managers and other users who **are not computer programmers** to control, manage, and track the execution of such tasks. (Col 2 lines 10-14 of Chatterjee, **Emphasis Added**)

...

The Layout menu facilitates insertion and deletion of steps, flow control points, and links within a workflow. A Select Operation choice, also accessible by button 381, **allows the user to choose an operation for a step from a list of previously-defined operations**. A Link Steps choice, also accessible by button 379, place mouse 114 in a mode where steps or flow control points are linked together by clicking on one and dragging a connection line to the other. A Delete choice, also accessible by button 380, places mouse 114 in a mode in which steps, flow control points, and links are removed from a workflow by clicking on them. A Normal choice returns operation of mouse

114 to conventional point-and-click mode after it has been in the Link or Delete Modes. A Detour mode allows insertion of a "detour" path to or from a workbasket or operation that is temporarily unavailable. (Col. 6, lines 33-48 of Chatterjee, ***Emphasis Added***)

From the above, it is concluded that Chatterjee contemplates providing the user the ability to control the flow of the operations, and does not address internal logic of any operation (arguable akin to the tasks of the subject application).

In particular, the Examiner's attention is directed to the fact that the above disclosure expressly teaches 'list of **pre-defined** operations' and also that the features are intended for 'users who are **not computer programmers**'.

Accordingly, it is concluded that Chatterjee does not teach or reasonably suggest at least the above noted features of currently amended claim 1.

Currently amended claim 1 is accordingly allowable over the art of record. Claims 2-6 and 8-10 depend from claim 1, and are allowable at least for the reasons noted above with respect to claim 1.

Currently amended claim 2 is independently allowable in reciting that a program logic constituting the built-in tasks (which by virtue of the recitation in claim 1 implement the work flow) are **not editable by a user**, and the user provides extensions to the work flow by specifying a desired program logic for a custom task (associated with the extension points contained in the built-in tasks).

In sharp contrast, the teachings of Chatterjee are limited to work flows that can be edited by the users.

Currently amended claim 11 is allowable over the art of record at least for some of the reasons noted above with respect to claim 1. Claims 12-16 and 18-20 depend from claim 11, and are allowable at least for the reasons noted above with respect to claim 11.

Currently amended claim 21 is allowable over the art of record at least for some of the reasons noted above with respect to claim 1. Claims 22-26 and 28-30 depend from claim 21, and are allowable at least for the reasons noted above with respect to claim 21.

5 Currently amended claim 31 is allowable over the art of record at least for some of the reasons noted above with respect to claim 1. Claims 32-36 depend from claim 31, and are allowable at least for the reasons noted above with respect to claim 31.

Conclusion

10 Accordingly all the objections and rejections of record are believed to be overcome. Continuation of examination is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative at 707.356.4172 if it is believed that an interview might be useful for any reason.

Date: June 5, 2008

Respectfully submitted,
/Narendra Reddy Thappeta/

Signature

Printed Name: Narendra Reddy Thappeta
Attorney for Applicant
Registration Number: 41,416